

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 20, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicant kindly requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection and rejections in view of the following remarks. Claims 3-9 and 11-20 are pending in the application.

As a preliminary matter, on page 8 of the Office Action, claims 16 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. However, Applicant respectfully notes claims 16 and 17 are rejected in the Office Action, and claims 18 and 19 are indicated in the Office Action Summary section as being objected to. Applicant assumes the Examiner has incorrectly objected to claims 16 and 17 on page 8 of the Office Action. Should Applicants assumption regarding the objection to claims 18 and 19 be incorrect, Applicant respectfully requests the opportunity to address the proper objection in a corrected Office Action. Applicant elects not to rewrite claims 18 and 19 to independent form at this time to permit the Examiner an opportunity to reconsider the objection and rejections of claims in view of the remarks presented in this Paper. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 3-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,078,375, issued to Matsumoto et al. (hereafter "Matsumoto") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,977,562, issued to Mihara (hereafter "Mihara") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,977,562, issued to Hirakata (hereafter "Hirakata"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because neither Matsumoto, Mihara, nor Hirakata, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Matsumoto, Mihara and Hirakata fail to teach a method of fabricating an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device "wherein the rubbing roll has a length corresponding to the short side", as recited in independent claim 3.

The Office Action concedes that Matsumoto and Hirakata fail to teach all the features recited in the claims of the present application. To remedy the deficient teachings of Matsumoto and Hirakata, the Office Action again, takes Official Notice regarding it being "well known in

the art to use a rubbing roll having a length corresponding to the short side of the substrate” and further relies upon FIG. 3 of Mihara to provide documentary support of the Official Notice. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits FIG. 3 of Mihara fails to provide the support and motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method described in Matsumoto and Hirakata to obtain a method having the combined features recited in independent claim 3 of the present application. Applicant notes FIGs. 3A and 3B of Mihara describe “the process for producing a liquid crystal device” (col. 8, lines 43-45). However, Applicant further submits nothing in the description of FIGs. 3A and 3B of Mihara teaches nor suggests a method of fabricating an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display “wherein the rubbing roll has a length corresponding to the short side” or “rubbing one of the first substrate and a second substrate in one direction, which can be any direction”, as recited in independent claim 3 of the present application. As such, Mihara fails to provide motivation of one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Matsumoto and Hirakata to provide a method of fabricating an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having all the combined features recited in independent claim 3. Accordingly, Mihara does not remedy the deficient teachings of Matsumoto and Hirakata. Thus, claim 3 and its dependent claims 4-6 and 8-9 are allowable over any combination of Matsumoto and Hirakata. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 7-12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Mihara in view of Hirakata and further in view of Japanese Application No. JP 09-325328, issued to Hakoda et al. (hereafter “Hakoda”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because neither Matsumoto, Mihara, Hirakata nor Hakoda, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Matsumoto, Mihara, Hirakata and Hakoda fail to teach a method of fabricating an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device “wherein the rubbing roll has a length corresponding to the short side”, as recited in independent claim 3, from which claims 7 - 9 depend. Applicant notes claim 10 was previously cancelled and should not be a part of the rejected claims identified on page 5 of the Office Action.

Matsumoto, Mihara, Hirakata and Hakoda further fail to teach an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device that includes “wherein the rubbing roller has a length corresponding to the second direction”, as recited in allowable independent claim 15, and its dependent claims 11, 12, 16 and 17.

Hakoda merely discloses a manufacturing method of a liquid crystal display device that includes “forming the panel patterns of varying sized plural liquid crystal display device panels on the mother glass plate and then cutting the glass” (see, Problem To Be Solve”). However, Hakoda fails to teach “the rubbing roller has a length corresponding to the short side”, as recited in independent claim 3, and “the rubbing roller has a length corresponding to the second direction”, as recited in independent claim 15 of the present application. As such, Hakoda does not remedy the deficient teachings of Matsumoto, Hirakata and Mihara.

Because Matsumoto, Mihara, Hirakata and Hakoda fail to teach at least the above features of independent claims 3 and 15, independent claim 3 and its dependent claims 7 - 9, and independent claim 15 and its dependent claims 11-12 and 16-17 are allowable over Matsumoto, Mihara, Hirakata and Hakoda. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto, Mihara, Hirakata and Hakoda and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,609,255, issued to Leenhouts (hereafter “Leenhouts”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because neither Matsumoto, Mihara, Hirakata, Hakoda nor Leenhouts, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Matsumoto, Mihara, Hirakata, Hakoda and Leehouts fail to teach an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device that includes “the rubbing roller has a length corresponding to the second direction” as recited in independent claim 15, from which claims 13 and 14 depend.

Leenhouts discloses a liquid crystal display device having front and back polarizers; however, Leenhouts fails to teach “the rubbing roll has a length corresponding to the second direction”, as recited in independent claim 15. Because Leenhouts fails to teach at least this feature of claim 15, Leenhouts does not remedy the deficient teachings discussed above with

respect to Matsumoto, Mihara, Hirakata and Hakoda. As such, independent claim 15 and its dependent claims 13 and 14 are allowable over Matsumoto, Mihara, Hirakata, Hakoda and Leenhouts. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicant believes the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant